REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 13, and 20, and 28-30 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Formal Matters

Interview Summary Under 37 C.F.R. §1.133

A telephonic interview occurred between the Applicants' attorney, Jodi Hartman, and Examiner Basehoar on April 5, 2005. The interview covered the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 20 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,896,321 to Miller et al. (hereinafter "Miller") in view of United States Patent No. 5,576,955 to Newbold et al. (hereinafter "Newbold"). The Examiner and the undersigned discussed proposed claim language that would possibly overcome the cited references.

II. Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Miller in View of Newbold

Claims 1-9 and 11-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Newbold. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method for correcting text input into a text document comprises receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the one or more text components of the text selection; receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component; in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted; if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection

adjacent the erroneous text component; and displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit via a user interface opened directly into the text document.

Miller does not disclose a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 1. On the contrary, Miller discloses a method for obtaining a prioritized list of word predictions for a partial data entry including monitoring the receipt of a string of characters into a program module; determining whether a partial data entry satisfies search criteria such as, for example, a minimum number of characters; if so, obtaining a prioritized list of word predictions from the word prediction system; determining whether the obtained word predictions satisfy display criteria such as, for example, a minimum number of additional characters more than the partial data entry; and if so, displaying the word predictions in priority order in a list box on the LCD display. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Miller fails to disclose receiving a selection of an erroneous data entry from the one or more entries of a text selection and receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous data entry. Instead, Miller discloses monitoring receipt of a partial data entry into a program module, and if the partial data entry includes a minimum number of characters, then displaying a list of word predictions to complete the partial data entry, without suggesting receiving a selection of an erroneous partial data entry and a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous partial data entry.

Moreover, Miller fails to disclose submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, and if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the partial data entry and at least one data entry from the data being entered adjacent the partial data entry. Instead, Miller discloses determining whether the partial data entry includes at least a predefined number of characters and whether the obtained word predictions include at least a predefined number of additional characters more than the partial data entry, without suggesting submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model to determine if the scope of correction needs to be adjusted, and if so, then receiving a text

14

unit including the partial data entry and at least one data entry from the data being entered adjacent the partial data entry.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Newbold to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies of Miller. However, Like Miller, Newbold does not teach or suggest a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 1. In contrast, Newbold teaches a method for handling errors in a data processing environment including scanning text for errors; when an error is detected, generating an error unit which contains information about the detected error; creating an Error List to communicate the detected errors to the user; and providing CorrectWith text that indicates the most likely correction for the error. Newbold teaches that possible error types include broken words and doubled words. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Newbold fails to teach or suggest in response to receiving a command to display the CorrectWith text for the detected error, submitting the detected error to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted; if the scope should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the detected error and at least one text component from the text adjacent the detected error; and displaying a CorrectWith text for the text unit. Instead, Newbold teaches detecting an error, such as doubled words, and providing a CorrectWith text for the doubled words that indicates the most likely correction for the doubled words, without suggesting submitting the doubled words to a correction scope model to determine if the scope of correction should be adjusted in response to receiving a command to display the CorrectWith text for the doubled words; if the scope should be adjusted, then receiving a text unit that includes the doubled words and at least one text component adjacent the doubled words; and displaying a CorrectWith text for the text unit.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold. Since claims 2-9, 11-12, and 28 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as

embodied in claims 2-9, 11-12, and 28 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 13 recites that a method for correcting text input into a text document comprises receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the one or more text components of the text selection; receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component; in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted; if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component; and displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit via a user interface opened directly into the text document.

Miller does not disclose a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 13. On the contrary, Miller discloses a method for obtaining a prioritized list of word predictions for a partial data entry including monitoring receipt of a partial data entry into a program module, determining whether a partial data entry satisfies search criteria such as, for example, a minimum number of characters; if so, obtaining a prioritized list of word predictions to complete the partial data entry from the word prediction system; determining whether the obtained word predictions satisfy display criteria such as, for example, a minimum number of additional characters more than the partial data entry; and if so, displaying the word predictions. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 13 because Miller fails to disclose receiving a selection of an erroneous data entry from the one or more entries of a text selection and receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous data entry. Instead, Miller discloses monitoring receipt of a partial data entry into a program module, and if the partial data entry includes a minimum number of characters, then displaying a list of word predictions to complete the partial data entry, without suggesting receiving a

16

selection of an erroneous partial data entry and a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous partial data entry.

Moreover, Miller fails to disclose submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, and if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the partial data entry and at least one data entry from the data being entered adjacent the partial data entry. Instead, Miller discloses determining whether the partial data entry includes at least a predefined number of characters and whether the obtained word predictions include at least a predefined number of additional characters more than the partial data entry, without suggesting submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model to determine if the scope of correction needs to be adjusted, and if so, then receiving a text unit including the partial data entry and at least one data entry from the data being entered adjacent the partial data entry.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Newbold to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies of Miller. However, Like Miller, Newbold does not teach or suggest a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 13. In contrast, as discussed above, Newbold teaches a method for handling errors in a data processing environment including scanning text for errors; when an error is detected, generating an error unit which contains information about the detected error; creating an Error List to communicate the detected errors to the user; and providing CorrectWith text that indicates the most likely correction for the error. Newbold teaches that possible error types include broken words and doubled words. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 13 because Newbold fails to teach or suggest in response to receiving a command to display the CorrectWith text for the detected error, submitting the detected error to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted; if the scope should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the detected error and at least one text component from the text adjacent the detected error; and displaying a CorrectWith text for the text unit. Instead, Newbold

teaches detecting an error, such as doubled words, and providing a CorrectWith text for the doubled words that indicates the most likely correction for the doubled words, without suggesting submitting the doubled words to a correction scope model to determine if the scope of correction should be adjusted in response to receiving a command to display the CorrectWith text for the doubled words; if the scope should be adjusted, then receiving a text unit that includes the doubled words and at least one text component adjacent the doubled words; and displaying a CorrectWith text for the text unit.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 13 is allowable over the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold. Since claims 14-19 and 29 depend from claim 13 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 14-19 and 29 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 20 recites that a method for correcting text input into a text document comprises receiving a selection of an erroneous text component from the one or more text components of the text selection; receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous text component; in response to receiving the command to display the list of alternatives to the erroneous text component, submitting the erroneous text component to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted; if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the erroneous text component and at least one text component from the text selection adjacent the erroneous text component; and displaying a list of alternatives to the text unit via a user interface opened directly into the text document.

Miller does not disclose a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 20. On the contrary, as discussed above, Miller discloses a method for obtaining a prioritized list of word predictions for a partial data entry including monitoring receipt of a partial data entry into a program module, determining whether a

partial data entry satisfies search criteria such as, for example, a minimum number of characters; if so, obtaining a prioritized list of word predictions to complete the partial data entry from the word prediction system; determining whether the obtained word predictions satisfy display criteria such as, for example, a minimum number of additional characters more than the partial data entry; and if so, displaying the word predictions. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 20 because Miller fails to disclose receiving a selection of an erroneous data entry from the one or more entries of a text selection and receiving a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous data entry. Instead, Miller discloses monitoring receipt of a partial data entry into a program module, and if the partial data entry includes a minimum number of characters, then displaying a list of word predictions to complete the partial data entry, without suggesting receiving a selection of an erroneous partial data entry and a command to display a list of alternatives to the erroneous partial data entry.

Moreover, Miller fails to disclose submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted, and if the correction scope model determines the scope of correction should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the partial data entry and at least one data entry from the data being entered adjacent the partial data entry. Instead, Miller discloses determining whether the partial data entry includes at least a predefined number of characters and whether the obtained word predictions include at least a predefined number of additional characters more than the partial data entry, without suggesting submitting the partial data entry to a correction scope model to determine if the scope of correction needs to be adjusted, and if so, then receiving a text unit including the partial data entry and at least one data entry from the data being entered adjacent the partial data entry.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Newbold to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies of Miller. However, Like Miller, Newbold does not teach or suggest a method for correcting text input into a text document as recited by claim 20. In contrast, as discussed above, Newbold teaches a method for handling errors in a data processing

environment including scanning text for errors; when an error is detected, generating an error unit which contains information about the detected error; creating an Error List to communicate the detected errors to the user; and providing CorrectWith text that indicates the most likely correction for the error. Newbold teaches that possible error types include broken words and doubled words. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 20 because Newbold fails to teach or suggest in response to receiving a command to display the CorrectWith text for the detected error, submitting the detected error to a correction scope model to determine if a scope of correction should be adjusted; if the scope should be adjusted, then receiving from the correction scope model a text unit that includes the detected error and at least one text component from the text adjacent the detected error; and displaying a CorrectWith text for the text unit. Instead, Newbold teaches detecting an error, such as doubled words, and providing a CorrectWith text for the doubled words that indicates the most likely correction for the doubled words, without suggesting submitting the doubled words to a correction scope model to determine if the scope of correction should be adjusted in response to receiving a command to display the CorrectWith text for the doubled words; if the scope should be adjusted, then receiving a text unit that includes the doubled words and at least one text component adjacent the doubled words; and displaying a CorrectWith text for the text unit.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 20 is allowable over the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold. Since claims 21-27 and 30 depend from claim 20 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 21-27 and 30 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Miller in View of Newbold and Oberteuffer

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Newbold and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,438,523 to Oberteuffer et al. (hereinafter "Oberteuffer"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of Miller and Newbold. Since claim 10 depends from claim 1 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Miller, Newbold, and Oberteuffer does not make obvious claim 10. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the final Office Action, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-30 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' attorney at 404.954.5042.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(404) 954.5100

Michael T. Lukon
Reg. No. 48,164